DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 421 794 EA 029 218

AUTHOR Cabraal, Liyana M. C.

TITLE "Practical Action": Its Centrality in Producing and Reproducing the Formal Structure of School Organization.

PUB DATE 1998-04-00

NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Diego, CA, April 13-17, 1998).

PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Accountability; Behaviorism; Elementary Secondary Education; *Organizational Theories; *School Organization; *Social Action; *Social Theories; *Theory Practice Relationship

IDENTIFIERS *Rationalism

ABSTRACT

The behaviorist world view, influential in many social-science disciplines, is challenged by theories of action. With steady developments in nonbehaviorist thinking and related social-action conceptions, the study of school organizational structure can be transformed into a field centered about the dynamics of individuals' practical actions. This paper tries to explain the various aspects of reality that are, in different degrees, inconsistent with rationalist and utilitarian assumptions. The paper explores several aspects of social theory concerned with practical action and hypothesizes using them as a theoretical scheme for understanding the functional logic of school organization's formal structure. School members' practical actions, consciousness, and reasoning function as a central element in producing and reproducing the formal structure of school organization. Rationality in everyday school settings is created from the practical, daily actions occurring within complex social environments. These actions develop largely from members' attempt to make actions accountable. Practical actions have indexality (meaningful context), are oriented toward building structures, and revolve about rules and norms. Individuals' practical actions produce and reproduce a larger system while remaining an essential part of it. (Contains 29 references.) (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

'Practical Action': Its Centrality in Producing and Reproducing the Formal Structure of School Organization

ED 421 794

Liyana M. C. Cabraal

College of Education

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association
San Diego, CA
April, 1998

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Cabraal

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

2

EA 029218

'Practical Action': Its Centrality in Producing and Reproducing the Formal Structure of School Organization

Introduction

Behaviorist world view which has been basically very influential in many of the social science disciplines, including education, is challenged by theories of action. With the steady developments in non behaviorist thinking and the related conceptions on social action, the study of the formal structure of school organization can be transformed into a field where much of the process of conceptualization is shaped by the analytical concerns of the dynamics of individuals' practical actions. Various actions people take in organizations and the meanings of them have become the center of concern in theories of action.

Under the influence of rational actor-models developed in natural sciences, organization theory inherited the assumption that the dynamics of organizations can be understood through the rational behavior of its actors. Also the structural details have been created, and elaborated as it demands for the persistence of such behavior in the hope that such an organizational arrangement would bring about the maximum satisfaction of people's needs. These structural arrangements are organizationally nourished by the accompanying assumptions developed around the formal structure. One major concern in this paper is to explain the various aspects of reality which are, in different degrees, inconsistent with these assumptions. The focus on practical actions of individuals in organizations represents a portion of a critical shift in organizational theory from the previous thinking based on utilitarianism and behaviorism. It provides a broad framework to examine the routine and taken-for-granted nature of actions in day to day affairs of work.

This paper is a theoretical inquiry which draws on several theoretical arguments on social action. It explores several aspects of social theory developed round the concept

of 'practical action', and the possibility of using them as a theoretical scheme for understanding the functional logic of the formal structure of school organization. The paper argues that the practical actions of the members of school and their practical consciousness and practical reasoning function as a central element in the process of producing and reproducing the formal structure of school organization.

In Aristotelian thinking, three basic categories of action are discussed: *praxis, poiesis, and theoria* (Kilminster, 1993). *Poiesis* can be seen as a productive form of action aimed at particular ends. *Theoria* means contemplation. The simplest meaning given to *praxis* is that it is a form of actions performed as an end in themselves (Kilminster, 1993). However, as Kilminister (1993) points out, *Praxis* is defined to include practical actions in a broader sense. He discusses several meanings of *praxis*: "a type of creative practical activity peculiar to human beings whereby they construct their world"; "an epistemological category describing the practical, object constituting activity of human subjects as they confront nature" (p. 507); and as a type of actions where it can be found " the unity of theory and practice"(p.508). These meanings of *praxis* show that practical actions of people can be construed as their day to day field of activities where they constantly construct their world using both their experience and contemplation on the subjects at hand. With Alfred Schutz, "the practices of commonsense knowledge of social structures of everyday activities, practical circumstances, practical activities, and practical sociological reasoning" have become a critical area of study in social theory (Garfinkel & Sacks, 1969/1986, pp. 162-163). "These phenomena have characterestic properties of their own and that thereby they constitute a legitimate area of inquiry in themselves" (Garfinkel & Sacks, 1969/1986, p.163).

Practical actions of individuals in organizations provide a broad latitude to examine the routine and taken-for-granted nature of those actions in day to day affairs of work. Those actions reveal an order of things or a patterning which is institutionally designed, and an institutionally evolved rationale which lie in the very core of the

educational process. Practical actions of individuals are the main focus of ethnomethodological thinking (Garfinkel, 1967; Garfinkel & Sacks, 1970; Filmer, 1972; Mehan & Wood, 1975; Flynn, 1991). Ethnomethodology is the study of what Garfinkel (1967) calls artful practices or the members' methods (Garfinkel, 1967; Hilbert, 1992). Ethnomethodology is a form of "investigation of the rational properties of indexical expressions and other practical actions as contingent ongoing accomplishments of organized artful practices of everyday life" (Garfinkel, 1967, p. 11). Instead of external motivation factors and individual characteristics frequently associated with studies in human behavior, ethnomethodology focuses on the common sense knowledge of the individuals and how they use it in day to day social situations as a foundation for practical reasoning.

Rationality in Practical Actions: A Source of Overall Structuring

One main characterestic in organization structures in schools is the manifestation of a continuous attempt schools make to build a rational arrangement between its multiple constituencies. To say that it is rational, 'is to emphasize the fact that it is methodically produced in situation, and that the activities are intelligible, that they can be described, and evaluated" (Coulon, 1995, p.23), and to agree with reason. Underneath all structural arrangements there lies a potential capacity associated with individuals' actions to determine the nature of the structural arrangement being attempted and its consequent results.

Garfinkel (1967) sees a large system of properties built around each individual's actions. He argues that in every day activities of individuals in organizations there is an organized systematic character and that rationality in organizations develops from those common practices. These individual actions occur in different social settings in school. Such a setting may be a classroom, a special program for remedial teaching, or a school discipline program. It can also be the total pattern of arrangements of school where

educational needs have been addressed in time and space.

The characterestic feature of these settings is that their rationality is created, to a large extent, from the practical day to day actions taking place within those environments. These day to day settings in school are complex social environments with a multitude of interactions where different meaning exchanges occur. Ethnomethodological thinking suggests that members in collectivities engage in attributing meanings to others' activities and they are engaged in a continuous process of understanding others' activities. This is a social phenomenon that produces and reproduces much of the organized educational process within school organization.

Garfinkel (1967) sees practical and commonplace activities and circumstances as "phenomena in their own right" (p.1). He sees practical actions or the everyday activities of the individuals as their "methods for making those same activities visibly-rational-and- reportable-for-all- practical -purposes, i.e., 'accountable', as organizations of commonplace everyday activities" (p.vii). In other words, practical actions "whereby members produce and manage settings of organized everyday affairs are identical with members' procedures for making those settings 'accountable' " (Garfinkel, 1967, p.1). By 'accountable' he means several things. One is that such practices should be "observable-and-reportable, *i.e.* available to members as situated practices of looking-and-telling" (p.1).

The rationality of day to day actions develop largely from members'attempt to make actions accountable. When it is said that action is accountable, it means, as Coulon (1995) sees, several features of action. Basically, action is describable if it is accountable. It is also intelligible. Further, it is reportable, and analyzable. These are some of the main characteristics of rationality in practical actions. As ethnomethodologists see, the world we live in is not a given. It is the constitution of people's practical accomplishments. "Actors permanently reconstruct a fragile and precarious social order to understand each other and to be able to communicate" (Coulon, 1995 p.26).

Study of their practical actions reveal how the world is constituted. As people's expressions do in communication, when people take action it reveals how they construct the order of things. The concept of accountability of action can be conveyed by suggesting several things. First, actions are orderly, meaning that in many ways they are not random occurrences; they are recurrent; they are meaningful; and that they are linked to a coherent scheme (Lynch, 1993). Secondly, the orderliness of the actions are observable: they are public in the sense that their "production can be witnessed and is intelligible rather than being an exclusively private affair"; [thirdly, the] "observable orderliness is *ordinary*. that is, the ordered features of social practices are banal, easily and necessarily witnessed by anybody who participates competently in those practices" (Lynch, 1993, p. 15). As Lynch (1993) points out, since these activities are orderly, their meanings are understood by and appealing to the members who appreciate them. They are describable, analyzable, and predictable.

Accounts of actions reveal how actors reconstruct the order of things to understand each other and interact with each other (Coulon 1995). They are not just plain descriptions of actions.

> "The property of these descriptions is not to describe the world, but to permanently reveal its constitution. It is the meaning that has to be given, in all ethnomethodological studies, to the expression 'account': If I describe a scene of my daily life, it is not because it describes the world that an ethnomethodologist can be interested in but because this description, by accomplishing itself, 'makes up' the world or builds it up. Making the world visible is making my action comprehensible in doing it, because I reveal its significance through the exposition of the methods by which I make an account of it (Coulon, 1995, p.26).

Rationality of action is also found in reflexivity of action. Here, reflexivity is not the same as reflection. It does not mean thinking about action while being engaged in it. "Members have no awareness of the reflexive character of their actions. They would be

incapable of pursuing engaged practical action if they were to maintain an awareness of the reflexive character of their action" (Coulon, 1995, p.22). Reflexivity refers to how actions both describe and constitute the social framework in which they take place, more specifically, the circumstances under which actions take place. It refers to the dimension of action which is characterized by the presupposition of the conditions which produce action, and also which is characterized by making action observable and recognizable. While we are acting we are building up the rationality of our action and also the meaning, and the order of it. "The descriptions of the social world become, as soon as they have been uttered, constitutive parts of what they have described" (Coulon, 1995, p.23).

Giddens (1984) explains more about the concept of reflexivity. He sees reflexivity of action "as the monitored character of the ongoing flow of social life" (Giddens, 1984, p.3). Reflexivity is a part of human knowledgebility and it recursively orders members' practices. Reflexivity of action is possible, as he argues, only because practices continue. There is a certain flow in purposive action, in how people act. Reflexivity emerges from continuous monitoring of action. People continuously monitor their individual actions, and also the flow of those actions. They want others to do the same. It is a part of everyday actions. It involves individual as well as others. Actors monitor continuously the flow of their actions, aspects, social and physical, of the contexts in which they move. In every day activities, in "circumstances of interaction - encounters and episodes" of action , (Giddens, 1984, p.3), monitoring of the setting of action, and also the different contexts in which action occurs is also a part of 'reflexive monitoring of action'. Giddens (1984) argues that reflexive monitoring of action is possible because of rationalization. By rationalization of action he means "that actors maintain a continuing 'theoretical understanding' of the grounds of their activity" (Giddens, 1984, p.5). In school, it can be argued that, through 'reflexive monitoring' (Giddens, 1984) of action, members constantly shape and reshape the formal structure. They need it for both survival and renewal. The rationality in organizational structure derives from the rational qualities of

members' practical actions. However, the origin is nonrational. Its a moral basis. As Durkheim saw this moral basis, it is solidarity which lies behind all utilitarian exchanges.

Indexicality of Practical Actions: A Generative Force of Structure

Indexicality refers to the expressions that draw their meanings from the context of those expressions. Indexical expressions are products of communication in language. They depend on the assumptions which are not stated explicitly. For the achievement of mutual sense they share knowledge. They refer to "the contextual determinations that are implicitly attached to a word" (Coulon, 1995, p.17). In terms of general action, indexical expressions are the cases of action where members of organizations refer to their common sense understanding of the social structures they experience on a day to day basis. As indexicality in linguistics means, a word is significant, on one hand, in a transsituational sense, and on the other, it is also distinctly significant in particular situations People's actions can also be viewed as they are significant both situationally and transsituationally. Also in comprehending action people need something more than the immediate information present with action. They need what Bar Hillal presents as 'indicative characteristics' of action. (Bar Hillal, 1954. As cited in Coulon, 1995, p. 17). Coulon (1995) points out,

> Indexicality points to the natural incompleteness of words, that words only take their complete sense in the context of their actual production, as they are 'indexed' in a situation of linguistic exchange. And even then, indexing does not eliminate possible ambiguities in their potential meanings. The significance of a word or an expression comes from contextual factors such as the speaker's biography, his immediate intention, the unique relationship he has with his listener, and their past conversations (p.17).

This indexical character of language is found in daily practical action. Social situations in daily life have an endless indexicality. There is a need in social inquiry to convert

objective expressions into indexical expressions (Coulon, 1995). In schools, the indexical character of actions is very prominent. The meaning of practical actions teachers take everyday expands across a wider context. Indexicalities of teachers' practical actions cause the production of different structural features around their actions. It occurs as an evolutionary organizational process. Some examples are how job breadth evolves over time, and a feature like teachers' discretion rises as a major structural element in instructional interactions.

Structure Building through Orientation of Practical Actions

The "ordinarily observable orderliness [in action] is *oriented*. Participants in orderly social activities orient to the sense of another's activities, and while doing so they contribute to the temporal development" (Lynch, 1993, p.14). In their daily activities, teachers orient their actions toward building structured environments for their further actions. Usually, within the school structure students' experiences are highly structured and regularized (Meyer, 1987). Both teachers and students, daily, experience an educational process where students cope with sequentially ordered classroom situations (Dreeben, 1968). Students, in this process, are identified with their organizational structure for instructional activities. For example, students are identified with the stratified organizational levels and the hierarchical classroom arrangements (Dreeben, 1968). The total functional structure of a school, to a large degree, can be a product of how teachers orient their daily activities for building further structures.

Orientation of action occurs as a part of an endless project of accomplishment (Schutz, 1932/1967; Garfinkel, 1967), or as Garfinkel (1967), more emphatically put it, "an endless, ongoing, contingent accomplishment" (p. 1). Actions taken in school are oriented toward building structures through a process of accomplishing tasks of different magnitude. In an organizational setting of instruction teachers are having several burdens of accomplishment. For example, people have to "produce and manage settings of

organized everyday affairs"(Garfinkel, 1967, p.1). Similarly, teachers have to create settings for learning as expected. That is one burden of accomplishment. Another is to carry on and sustain those actions as rational procedures in particular instructional settings. They have to make those actions as rational as possible within the whole organized scheme of things in the school. These burdens of accomplishment continuously define, produce and reproduce structural components around action. The experiences of coping with such burdens are embodied in the broad system of meanings of the institutional structure.

The day to day practical actions in school which are oriented toward numerous ends within an endless project of accomplishment link past, present, and future in a coherent pattern. Those actions bring together numerous forces to produce a system of functional logic to build and maintain the desired order in structure. Order is primarily based on a system of internal logic which can be called as "logics of action" (Bacharach & Mundell, 1993). This system of internal logics implicitly relates means to ends within the structure and continuously attempts to build and maintain a coherence among diverse objectives (Bacharach & Mundell, 1993; Friedland & Alford, 1991). Day to day actions produce this system of logic. Even the rules and regulations around actions contribute to this system by way of how teachers and students define and interpret them.

Organizational Structure as an Extension of the Structures of Practical Actions

In formal structure of schools what we find is not only norms, rules developed around the teaching-learning process, or job descriptions, formal responsibilities of teachers, we also find values, sentiments, fears, and identities of teachers and students. We also find how various activities and responsibilities have been ordered in a predetermined pattern within school organization. Teachers and students use all these things to express themselves and explain others' actions and to understand their

implications on particular social settings and the overall organizational life. Structure of organization is also a manifestation of a way of ordering or an indigenous theory in organization (Turner, 1983). When we analyze further, organizational structures reveal more aspects of its reality. For example, Giddens (1984) sees structure as

> "a 'virtual order' of transformative relations [meaning] that social systems, as reproduced social practices, do not have 'structures' but rather exhibit 'structural properties' and that structure exists, as time- space presence, only in its instantiations in such practices and as memory traces orienting the conduct of knowledgeable human agents" (p.17).

He also argues that in this virtual order the significant feature is not only 'presences'. But in the whole patterning 'absences' also count equally. Especially, what is more significant in the whole structuring phenomenon within organization is the 'intersection of presence and absence'. Absence of action, just as the presence of it, is an integral part of practical action which contribute in forming the functional logic of formal structure just like the power and significance Foucault saw in silence in creating friendships and having relationships with people. Most of the aspects of organizational structure do not exist as clear surface manifestations. For example, one of such aspects is revealed in how Levi-Strauss sees structures. He sees them as "members of a limited class of formal possibilities" (Turner, 1983. p.189). "To explain [them] is to discover an order of relations that turns a set of bits, which have limited significance of their own, into an intelligible whole. This order may be termed the 'structure' " (Turner, 1983. p.191).

Structure in school refers to both rules and resources. Rules and resources are central to the production and reproduction of organizational structures. It is not only specific instances or small fractions of conduct rules are rferred to. They also refer to the conduct of social life where "practices are sustained in conjunction with more or less loosely organized sets" (Giddens, 1984, p.23). Rules are transformational. They interact with resources and transform loose social situations into, at least to a certain degree,

organized and structured situations of actions. In this process of interaction between rules and resources, constantly, they create and recreate transformative relations for production and reproduction of structure.

The day-to-day actions of teachers and students produce and reproduce the structural properties of school organizations. Those day-to-day practical actions have structures (Garfinkel & Sacks, 1986). Individual actors both draw upon and reproduce structural properties.

> "Analyzing the structuration of social systems means studying the modes in which such systems, grounded in the knowledgeable activities of situated actors who draw upon rules and resources in the diversity of action contexts, are produced and reproduced in interaction" (Giddens, 1984, p.25).

Giddens(1984), in explaining the structuration theory, argues that "the rules and resources drawn upon in the production and reproduction of social action are at the same time the means of system reproduction (the duality of structure)" (Giddens, 1984, p.19).

However, as Giddens (1984) sees, the role rules play in this relationship depends on the types of rules. For example, formalized prescriptions like rules which are similar to rules of games do not play a big role in reproducing social systems. "Even those which are codified as laws are characteristically subject to a greater diversity of contestations than the rules of games" (Giddens, 1984, p.23). In one sense, rule is like a habit or a routine. Rules also have a constitutive and regulative sense. But the most effective sense of rule is found in the nature of formulae (Giddens, 1984). A formula indicates a procedure which can be generalized to a range of action situations, may be even in different social contexts. Since it indicates a procedure it implicates a " methodical continuation of an established sequence" (Giddens, 1984, p.21). In this sense they are like linguistic rules. They are the methodical procedures of day-to-day practical actions of people.

Human knowledgebility is characterized by the practical consciousness of people,

and awareness of social rules is a central component in practical consciousness.

> As social actors, all human beings are highly 'learned' in respect of knowledge which they possess, and apply, in the production and reproduction of day-to-day social encounters; the vast bulk of such knowledge is practical rather than theoretical in character (Giddens, 1984, p.22).

People use 'typified schemes (formulae)' in their daily actions. They are competent of the procedures of those activities. Their knowledge of procedures and techniques of action suggests that their practical knowledge in day-today activities is methodological. As Giddens (1984) points out,

> such knowledge does not specify all the situations which an actor might meet with, nor could it do so; rather, it provides for the generalized capacity to respond to and influence an indeterminate range of social circumstances (p.22).

General meaning structures of practical actions and, specifically, the common-sense understanding of the members define and create structure. They build structural elements around action. Interpretive knowledge actors have in explaining cause and effect relationships in social action and subjective meanings they attach to action are associated with meaning structures of action (Scott, 1994; Weber, 1947; Geertz, 1973).

Organizational structure of school stimulates different kinds of individual and collective actions and makes up the total educational process mostly through meaning structures of practical actions. Educational tasks individuals in schools are involved in are connected to an unending process of projection and anticipation or, as Schutz (1932/1967) puts it, to 'a phantasying of action' through the network of meaning structures in school.

Giddens (1984) argues that human actions are recursive. That is to say that they are continually recreated by repeated application of the rules and meanings associated with the actions actors are already familiar with. In this process of recreation of action they also create the conditions which make the continuation of such action possible. This

also makes possible for the structural elements to evolve round different aspects of action. As the theory of structuration suggests structure represents a duality. Giddens (1984) argues,

> "The constitution of agents and structures are not two independently given sets of phenomena. ..... According to the notion of the duality of structure, the structural properties of social systems are both medium and outcome of the practices they recursively organize. Structure is not 'external' to individuals... .... it is ....more 'internal' than exterior to their activities" (p. 25).

Giddens (1984) argues that structure refers to structuring properties as well as to rules and resources. Structuring properties constantly build and maintain links between time and space and lend social practices a systemic form by making it possible "for discernibly similar social practices to exist across varying spans of time and space". (Giddens, 1984, p.17).

Structural principles are "the most deeply embedded structural properties, implicated in the reproduction of societal totalities" (Giddens, 1984, p.17). These principles create structure and also extend them in time and space. The structures of action which extend in both time and space have more potential in contributing toward producing the overall structure of the school.

A concept similar to structures of action in education has been discussed by Bossert (1978, 1979). He has shown that rather than the characteristics of individuals in school, complex organizational elements like interaction patterns emerge from the activity structures of classrooms. Employing the concept of activity structures, Bossert (1978, 1979) focuses on how daily activities are structured in classroom. He argues,

> "As teacher and pupils interact within the context of recurrent classroom activities, patterns of interaction emerge and particular social relationships develop. To the extent that classrooms employ different activity structures, different interaction patterns should emerge" (Bossert, 1979, p.1).

This view is a sharp departure from the conceptualization that individuals' characteristics are the primary determiners of behavior in classroom processes. Bossert (1978, 1979) focuses on how social interaction emerges through the frame of social organization of the learning environment. When dealing with people processing institutions and studying the outcomes of their processing , their structural properties are very important since those properties contribute largely in determining the patterns of recurrent conditions under which organizational members interact (Bossert, 1979; Wheeler, 1966). As Bossert (1979) points out, Dreeben (1968), and Bidwell (1972) have also applied this idea in discussing school organization and socialization and related schooling effects. As Rosenholtz & Rosenholtz (1981) view Bossert's (1978, 1979) argument,

> "it is within the context of recurrent daily activities that teacher and students come to make judgments about self and others. He theorizes that the structure of activities orders the shared experiences and possible interpretations of events available to participants, by orienting attention and behavior to some purposes and not others. Actors come to acquire shared meanings as they define and respond to events in a reciprocal manner" (Rosenholtz & Rosenholtz, 1981,p.133).

The conceptualization of the activity structures of "recurrent daily activities" can be viewed as a broad conceptualization which is inclusive enough to accommodate the daily developments taking place within the structures of actions and how they extend toward reproducing the overall structure of the school.

Recognition of Actors' Knowledge and Producing Structure

The recognition of what teachers do, how all members of education depend on each other's practical actions, and the taken-for-grantedness of those actions generate

around the actions "distinguishing and particular features.....[and also].....resources, troubles, projects, and the rest" (Garfinkel, 1967, p. 1-2). Those elements are essential parts of the functional formal structure in education. Garfinkel (1967) argues that people recognize, take for granted, and depend upon the knowledge, skills, and competence of the different parties who do those practices.

This means that those practical actions constantly cause the production and reproduction of a larger system around them and a wide order, a patterning of different forces, while remaining as an essential part of that ever growing system. Elaborating on the same point, Giddens (1984) argues ".....the rules and resources drawn upon in the production and reproduction of social action are at the same time the means of system reproduction" (p.19). Giddens (1984), further, argues "Knowledge of procedure, or mastery of the techniques of 'doing' social activity, is by definition methodological. That is to say, such knowledge does not specify all the situations which an actor might meet with, nor could it do so; rather, it provides for the generalized capacity to respond to and influence an indeterminate range of social circumstances" (p. 22). Various types of rules within such knowledge "are locked into the reproduction of institutionalized practices" (Giddens, 1984, p.22). These arguments suggest that rules, individuals' knowledge, and other resources built around action are essential parts of producing and reproducing organizational structures.

The 'practical consciousness' (Garfinkel, 1967; Bourdieu, 1977; Giddens, 1984) of members of education in school who invent and use different formulae in their daily course of educational action constantly produces and reproduces the formal structure of education within school organization. The formal structure of the school is produced and reproduced by the constant interaction of the institutional order of education and the practical consciousness of all members participating in the educational process in school. Consequently, the actual functional formal structure in the school is not just a hierarchically ordered patterning of rules, resources, and relationships alone, but most

significantly, a "virtual order of transformative relations"(Giddens, 1984, p.17). The practical actions of all concerned in school transform the relations between organizational elements constantly. Those actions are positioned in multiple ways within the formal structure of school. Since they are positioned in multiple ways, they form 'routinized intersections of practices' (Giddens, 1984, p.xxxi) within the structure. For example, a certain authority they enjoy can derive from the intersection of several practices. One such intersection would be generated from the practices of grouping children for instructional purposes in elementary classrooms, resource selection for instruction, and implementing special programs.

In coping with various burdens of accomplishment, understanding their complexities, and attending to the related instructional needs teachers may have to draw from and refer to, for example, multitude of rules of different nature including formal laws, and also traditions, conventions, or beliefs of different kinds. The meanings of their actions may reflect various ideologies and theories related to action in education. For example, teachers may turn to democratic ideals in shaping their activities. A possible broad system of theories would be dominant scientific theories and their related specific propositions which may govern teacher actions. There can also be some historical background for what teachers do. Teachers may also confront various constraints imposed by the larger system and they constantly utilize these experiences in building structure around their own individual actions and also around the actions of others.

Today in education there is much emphasis on understanding and explaining the deep structures that underlie the observable organizational action in education. To understand these deep structures study is needed of both compatibilities and contradictions within school organization.

Practical actions reveal an order of things or a patterning which is designed according to the realities of the organized educational process, and also a broad rationale of action. The definitions and the meanings of the forces and structures related to

education are formed, tested and evolved within a broad structure of action in education. When the examinations of the organizational dynamics of education are grounded on the practical nature of individuals' actions it is possible to identify some comprehensive patterns which run across different dimensions of action in school. Different aspects of practical action produce such patterns in school. These patterns serve as agents in producing and reproducing the formal structure. Study of practical actions of members showshow they produce, in their day-to-day life, the coherent, strong, orderly patterns of organizational structures.

References

Bacharach, S. B., & Mundell, B. L. (1993). Organizational politics in schools: Micro, Macro, and logics of action. Educational Administration Quarterly, 29(4), 423-452.

Bidwell, C. E. (1972). Schooling and socialization for moral commitment. Interchange, (3), 1-27.

Bossert, S. T. (1978). Activity structures and student outcomes. Paper prepared for the National Institute of Education's Conference on School Organization and Effects. San Diego, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 201 695)

Bossert, S. T. (1979). Tasks and social relationships in classrooms: A study of classroom organization and its consequences. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). Outline of a theory of practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Collins, R. (1992). Foreword. In Richard A. Hilbert, The classical roots of ethnomethodology. The University of North Carolina Press. Chapel Hill. p. xi.

Coulon, A. (1995). Ethnomethodology. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Dreeben, R. (1968). On what is learned in school. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Filmer, P. (1972). On Harold Garfinkel's ethnomethodology. In Paul Filmer et al. New Directions in Sociological Theory. 203-234. Cambridge:MIT Press.

Flynn, P. J. (1991). The ethnomethodological movement. New York: Mouton de Gruyter

Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. (1991). Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices, and institutional contradictions. In W. G. Powell., & P. G. DiMaggio (Eds.), The new institutionalism in organizational analysis (pp. 232-263). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). Studies in ethnomethodology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Garfinkel, H. (1987). The strange seriousness of professional sociology. A Lecture given

in a conference titled "Analysis of Actions and Analysis of Conversation". Paris. Cited in Coulon, A. (1995). Ethnomethodology. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Garfinkel, H., & Sacks, H. (1969/1986). On formal structures of practical actions. In Garfinkel, H. (Ed.). Ethnomethodological Studies of Work. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, pp. 160-193.

Garfinkel, H. & Sacks, H. (1970). The formal properties of practical actions. In John C. McKinney & Edward A. Tiriyakian (eds.), Theoretical Sociology. New York. Appleton, Century, Crofts. pp. 337-366.

Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures. New York: Basic Books.

Giddens, A. (1984). The constitution of society. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.

Hilbert, R. A. (1992). The classical roots of ethnomethodology. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Kilminster, R. (1993). Praxis. In William Outhwaite & Tom Bottomore (Eds.), The Blackwell Dictionary of twentieth-century social thought (pp. 507-509). Oxford: Blackwell.

Lynch, M. (1993). Scientific practice and ordinary action. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mehan, H., & Wood, H. (1976). De-secting ethnomethodology. American Sociologist, 11, Feb., 13-21.

Meyer, J. W. (1987). Implications of an institutional view of education for the study of educational effects. In M. T. Hallinan (Ed.), The social organization of schools: New conceptualizations of the learning process (pp. 157-175). New York: Plenum.

Rosenholtz, S. J., & Rosenholtz, S. H. (1981). Classroom organization and the perception of ability. Sociology of Education, 54, 132-140.

Schutz, A. (1967). The phenomenology of the social world (G. Walsh & F. Lehnert,

Trans.). Northwestern University Press. (Original work published 1932).

Scott, R. W. (1994). Institutions and organizations: Toward a theoretical synthesis. In R. W. Scott, J. W. Meyer, & Associates (Eds.), Institutional environments and organizations (pp. 55- 80). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Turner, S. (1983). Studying Organization through Levi-Strauss's Structuralism. In Gareth Morgan, Beyond Method.Sage Publications, Inc. Beverly Hills, California. pp. 189-201.

Weber, M. (1947). The theory of social and economic organization (A. M. Henderson & T. Parsons, Trans.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Wheeler, S. (1966). The structure of formally organized socialization settings. In O. Brim, & S. Wheeler (Eds.). Socialization after childhood (pp. 53-116). New York: John Wily.